

Category	Criteria	Comments	Pts
Title	Clear, Interesting, Focused	Good – It is clear and focused Could improve – is ‘personal income’ really the same as ‘per capita income’?	5
Author/Contact Info	Your name and email addr.	Good – Cruz: cool name Could improve – can’t think of anything	0
Abstract	Summarizes I,D,M,R,D in 3-6 brief clear sentences.	Good – summarizes everything well Could improve – more than 6 sentences (but it didn’t feel long when reading)	5
Introduction	Brief, clear, to the point; context for the problem; What is the problem/aim of the study? What questions will be answered?	Good – It is clear and to the point Could improve – I may be wrong, but I think using ‘robust’ in reference to statistics means something specific stats-wise, not just the typical English definition.	10
Data	How was the data generated? By whom? Variable definitions, sample size, quick numerical summaries of the variables and initial EDA. Don't forget to add some sentences/paragraphs explaining everything!	Good – I like the inclusion of missing states and duplicate county names Could improve – Should the Figure 1 be right after the paragraph mentioning it? not after the start of Methods?	5
Methods	List the methods and/or analyses that will be used to answer each question stated in the Introduction. No data analysis, graphing, model fitting, etc. appears here	Good – good descriptions as well as preview of what the results will mean after the methods are done (for question 2) Could improve – Is stepwise AND all subsets necessary? Since as Brian explained once in office hrs – “stepwise is an approximation of all subsets”. My interpretation is that stepwise is only used when all subsets would take forever (like if you tried to do it with the interactions included in this data), but I could be off.	5
Results	Statistical analysis & results in order parallel to Intro & Methods; no new methods or data; no big picture discussion	Good – descriptions are clear and easy to follow and I like the bulleted list of interpretations for question 3.	10

		<p>Could improve – question 1: is the statement “None of the scatterplots show a linear relationship between the response and the predictors” accurate? per cap income vs pct bach degrees looks kinda linear to me. pct hs grad is borderline as well.</p> <p>Question 3: Why were VIFs used to remove population and total income before variable selection? I thought VIFs were only calculated after a model is found. I think the ‘collinearity... intuitive’ thing might be a good enough justification.</p> <p>question 4: are the 440 counties really representative of the 3000 US counties after the way they were chosen for the dataset?</p>	
Discussion	Recap findings; address main problem/question; strengths & weaknesses; implications, unanswered questions, future research	<p>Good – good discussion of study limitations</p> <p>Could improve – looks good but “...confirmed several existing theories” is kind of vague. It’s probably fine. I’m not sure how much detail is expected.</p>	10
Mechanics	Follows C-C-C as much as possible (sentences, paragraphs & sections); Grammatical; Easy to follow	<p>Good – Sentence and paragraph logic is easy to follow. <i>Additionally</i>, there are nice GRE essay-style transitional words guiding the flow throughout.</p> <p>Could improve – can’t think of anything</p>	5
Statistical Content	Correctly and appropriately uses technical and non-technical material we have learned in class. Easy to follow; Analysis makes sense/not crazy (roughly 10% per research question)	<p>Good – Anything that fits here was mentioned in the Methods/Results sections. It all looks good. The stuff I mentioned is more for future consideration, not meant to suggest any major changes are needed.</p> <p>Could improve – mentioned above</p>	40
References & Citations	Follow ASA guide, “The Reference List” & “Reference Citations” (be sure to cite all sources!)	<p>Good – looks good</p> <p>Could improve – The inline citation of Worldpopulationreview.com stuck out but it’s probably not wrong. I don’t really know</p>	5

Technical Appendix	Helps me to understand your paper and give you max points above; Easy to follow. Complete analyses: R code, output, graphs, tables, and comments explaining what you did and why.	Good – I like the labeled Parts A, B, etc Could improve – Looks good. Maybe add titles/captions to some of the tables?	0
--------------------	---	---	---